WRITTEN DECISION
OF THE INTERNATIONAL

International file reference

EXAMINATION AUTHORITY (SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)

PCT/EP2005/05066

Re. Point V

JC20 Recuperation 97 NOV 2005

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statements

Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: DE 101 30 536 Al (Siemens AG) 9 January 2003 (2003-01-09)
- D2: GB-A-2 336 975 (SIMOCO INTERNATIONAL LIMITED) 3
 November 1999 (1999-11-03)
- D3: US 2003/119487 Al (SILVESTER KELAN C) 26 June 2003 (2003-06-26)
- 1. The present application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT because the object of claims 1 - 15 is not based on an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3).
- 1.1 The document D1 is seen as the closest prior art in relation to the object of claim 1. It discloses (the references in brackets relate to this document):

A method for delayed entering into a conversation or renewed entering into a conversation at least one radio communication device in an already existing push-to-talk group discussion of a number of radio communication devices ([0001]), of which the issued conversation totals have been stored previously in at least one intermediate exchange unit, in that one or more missed conversation totals are transmitted by the exchange unit to the radio communication device entering the push-to-talk group discussion late and are reproduced on this device ([0006]-[0010]).

The object of claim 1 thus differs from D1 in that the group discussion involved is a push-to-talk connection.

International file reference

EXAMINATION AUTHORITY (SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET) PCT/EP2005/05066

The object to be achieved with present invention can thus be seen as the ability to play back missed conversation totals in a push-to-talk system.

This cannot be regarded as inventive (Article 33(3) PCT) since it is evident to the person skilled in the art that methods already known from the group discussion in D1 can be applied to a push-to-talk system.

- 1.2 The same reasoning then applies to independent claims 13-15.
- 1.3 The dependent claims 2-12 do not contain any features, which in combination with the features of any claim to which they relate, fulfill the requirements of the PCT in relation to novelty or inventive step, see the documents D1-D3 and the points in the text referenced in the Examination Report.